[Translated from Russian]

 Viktor Medvedchuk

Causes of the conflict. Was the Ukrainian tragedy inevitable?

https://ria.ru/20230208/ukraina-1850358624.html

The Ukrainian conflict, that is being actively discussed in the world media, has become the cornerstone of world politics and will have far-reaching consequences, but even some analysts, who usually take matters very seriously don't even try to accurately predict how it will all end. However, in order to understand how it will all end, you need to understand how it all began. And it turns out that for many politicians it is counterproductive to recall the numerous events that preceded the tragedy, since they try to show them in a completely different light.

The United States has failed in world leadership

The collapse of the USSR, and of the entire socialist bloc in Europe, offered the United States a unique chance for the sole world leadership, which was an unusually rare and unique phenomenon in history. Washington decided to follow the principle of building a super-empire, where decisions are made in the United States, and the "provinces" are required to show an unquestioning obedience. That is, the Americans will think, manage, shape trends and fashion, and the rest of the world will follow the instructions and labor under the watchful eye of American management.

But something went wrong here. Having fallen into a political and economic dependency from the United States, most of the countries have not so much gained as lost. They were hit by economic crises, some even plunged into civil wars and poverty. The new order was supposed to pull the world out of poverty and bloodshed, but it did not happen.

A great number of problems remained unsolved on the post-Soviet territory. The economic potential of the former Soviet republics, as a rule, did not grow, but fell. There was increase in the number of social problems, the emergence of ethnical intolerance that did not exist before, and the armed conflicts that were previously unthinkable. All this caused the sense of nostalgia for the peaceful times of social security and constant economic growth of the past. However, the "independent" media, that was built according to the American manuals, declared such sentiments as a dangerous heresy that was undermining the foundations of the world order.

Over the course of 30 years, Russia has gradually turned from an exemplary student of Washington into its antagonist. Isn't it weird that when refusing the advice and patronage of the United States, the country becomes stronger, richer and more influential? Ukraine, on the contrary, remained the most faithful one to the pro-American course, which ultimately turned it into the poorest country in Europe. Does it look like that today's Ukraine is desperately fighting to defend its poverty? It is more logical to assume that the question is not that simple. The United States found it important to preserve the pro-American vector of

Ukraine with all its might in order to cover up its own political bankruptcy. It is not difficult to assume that after Ukraine changes its political orientation, a lot of countries will follow its example, and the US will start losing its global monopoly. That's why the US is paying so much attention to the conflict and spending billions of dollars in aid taken from the American taxpayer's money.

The EU has not built a common European home

Pro-American Ukrainian politicians have never concealed that their main objective was to prevent Russia from joining Europe, and to drive a wedge between the EU and Russia. As for the European Union, the question of its expansion and functioning became more and more formal. The leadership of the European Union brought up in the Ukrainian managers not so much as any principles, as ordinary dependent attitudes. The Ukrainian official knew that when the country joins the EU, his or her salary would increase, not at all interested in where the funds for this would come from.

For the newly joining countries the European dream was a dream of getting an economic donor, and not a desire to become an equal partner with the leading European countries. The European Union makes the same mistake as the Soviet Union did, when a few republics fed the rest. That creates a situation, when the leadership of subsidized regions turns into specialists in wringing money out of the center, not caring much about those who filled the common budget.

It stood to reason that the EU did not want to get on its balance sheet such a large and unsettled country as Ukraine. And the problem is not that Ukraine is a poor country – it does not lack neither natural resources nor hardworking people. The problem is that the European Union could not cope with the management of the countries that were already part of it, and the addition of another large country would only add more disorder to the state of chaos, which was already in abundance.

However, the EU was not going to let Ukraine get away from its sphere of influence either. After all, if Ukraine enters the orbit of a renewed Russia, then the European myth will be shattered just like the American one. And all this makes the champions of both myths to form an alliance. The destruction of the European myth means the beginning of the collapse of the EU, with the European bureaucracy losing its power for good and all.

But why should other countries, and Russia in particular, be concerned about the interests of European bureaucrats? If the building of a new Europe is not going well and reminds you of the Tower of Babel, then why should other countries pay for it with their own interests? We are talking not just about Russia, but also about several countries in Asia, South America and Africa, that are catching up with Europe in the development of technologies and the quality of goods.

We are witnessing here a conflict of interests between the East and the West, that was already present at the very beginning of the Cold War. It brings up questions of the redistribution of markets, the revision of currency calculations and the international distribution of labor. And besides that, there are reasonable concerns about the level of American and European management skills, that the other nations and states should obey them. Usually that kind of problems is resolved by the fist fights. It all starts with the provocation of local wars, and history has not come up with anything new here.

Ukraine as a testing ground for foreign games

To start a local war, you usually need to use either a closely related nations (Croats - Serbs, Russians – Ukrainians), or even one nation (Chinese - Chinese (Taiwan)). To set one against the other is sometimes a

difficult task, and in case of Ukrainians against Russians it's been going on for more than a generation. Western pillars of democracy not only turned a blind eye to the systematic persecution of Russians, but also tacitly encouraged it.

In the Ukrainian conflict, the word "national" has completely lost its ethnic meaning, giving way to a political one. Today's Ukraine is in the hands of people whose native language is not Ukrainian, and most of whom are not ethnical Ukrainians. They have turned the Ukrainian language into a "friend or foe" identifier, that helps them to hide their true intentions.

The West has absolutely no interest in the development of Ukrainian culture and language. They need soldiers who can fight for their interests, namely, for the monopoly of the US world leadership and the elimination of everyone who challenges it. Any questions about the fairness of the US world domination are declared a heresy and insanity that must be severely punished. All this is disguised by the outward concern for the Ukrainian interests and the struggle against Russian enslavers.

A common or related culture is used here for a reason. Such a hybrid war can actively use Russians against Russians, and against the interests of the Russian state – that is, against the survival and development of their own people. The history of the Ukrainian Maidans shows how popular demands, that are fair and harmless by themselves, can through the means of manipulation, degenerate into anti-state coups and bloody reprisals against the opponents. It also makes the participants of the events hostages of the situation, when they must support the putschists in the future because they cooperate in a greater overall process. And the process itself is steered against the development of the country, against the interests of its people. Only a small part of Maidan participants can see the light immediately.

Ukrainian history has shown that the information war begins long before the unrest starts. It permeates the media, culture, education, science, and public life. Only a small fraction of the participants in these processes realize that they are instruments in the wrong hands. The experience gained of such manipulations is going to be used against Russia, and it is already being used.

Neo-Nazism as a political weapon of the West

Neo-Nazism in modern warfare comes to the front when the pro-Western forces are starting to lose. The West's problem is that it sets the rules and then cannot win by these self-imposed rules. Let's take democracy for example, which the West supposedly defends with all its might in Ukraine. The Ukrainian experience shows that as soon as any non-pro-Western force begins to win, with its ratings going up, the pro-Western forces start to do everything to ban it. At the end of 2020, the Opposition Platform - For Life party started to lead in the ratings. At the beginning of 2021, without any legal grounds, its members started to experience persecution and repression, sanctions were imposed, and later the party, like many other non-pro-Western parties, was banned.

Before the beginning of these repressions, there was a batch of radicals who were introduced into the mass media, and who started to throw unfounded accusations against the opposition politicians, to intimidate their supporters and to demand indiscriminate reprisals. The West did not see in this neither incitement to hatred, nor calls for violence and lawlessness, as, in fact, didn't see any subsequent violence and lawlessness.

When during the Maidan events the pro-Western forces took their supporters to the streets, the Western media presented it as an act of heroism and an instance of upholding democracy. When the pro-Russian

forces in Odessa did the same, the demonstrators were forced to retreat into the House of Trade Unions and were burned alive. This murder of peaceful demonstrators was also declared to be a victory for democracy.

Stormtroopers of the pro-Western forces can safely organize safaris to hunt living people, attack peaceful demonstrations, beat, kneel, maim, kill, organize persecution, seize and destroy property – no one will ever bring them to justice. Any attempts by the population to defend themselves against these thugs are regarded as being an act of aggression and separatism.

At the time when pro-Western media had a monopoly on the truth in Ukraine, the journalists were put above the law, with any of their actions being declared to be a democracy and freedom of speech. When, despite the exerted pressure, it is possible to create media outlets where there is not only a pro-Western point of view (although a pro-Western one does also exist), then such media are declared a propaganda, and journalists are declared traitors. Such media outlets are shut down without any law, their journalists are placed on numerous "kill lists" and subjected to harassment and persecution.

All of the abovementioned is not an invention or random cases, but an established system of pressure, with every decent citizen of Ukraine coming across it in one way or another. Neo-Nazism is the truncheon that pro-Western forces pull out when they lose. That's when the mask of democracy and peacekeepers falls off in an instant, and the opponent goes back to the harsh reality of political cannibalism.

Zelensky betrayed the interests of Ukraine in exchange for a standing ovation from the West

Only people who don't know anything about the real situation in the country can say that Ukrainians did not fight against neo-Nazism, the infringement of their rights and the destruction of their country. In Donbass, unarmed people blocked the path of tanks, in Kiev they fearlessly saved from desecration the monuments to soldiers of the Great Patriotic War, shouting in the face of the neo-Nazis: "Fascism shall not pass!", in Odessa they died in fire, but did not surrender.

Not many people can comprehend the scale of hardship that those who did not want to kneel before the overseas masters had to endure. The pro-Western forces had enormous resources on their side. They had a powerful propaganda system with extensive experience in manipulation and brainwashing, and those who did not want to give up had to face the neo-Nazi stormtroopers who had license to shoot unwanted people.

Yet even in these conditions, the non-Western opposition comes in second place in the 2019 elections. That was despite the fact that the Crimea and Donbass did not participate in the elections, and Zelensky did all he could to promise peace and national reconciliation. By the end of 2020, the sociological polls showed that President Zelensky's Servant of the People party had lost its leadership, and Zelensky was most likely going to be replaced by a representative from the Opposition Platform - For Life party.

That's when Zelensky found it necessary to start looking for enemies and war. He took off his peacemaker mask and turned to military rhetoric. From that moment on, Ukraine was doomed to become a hot spot on the world map. The country was thrown into the fire because of the exorbitant ego of a man who got to power. Today the West flatters his ego at every opportunity. It was a great piece of luck to find a ruler who, for the sake of a spectacular picture, was ready to destroy his own country, and earn his ratings on the blood and suffering of his citizens. For the sake of a standing ovation and a beautiful pose, Zelensky sent the peace, legality and stability of his country to the slaughterhouse.

Zelensky is the fifth column for the destruction of Ukraine and Europe

If Zelensky had not been so selfish and dishonest, the war could and should have been prevented. If he thought more about the benefits of his country, about the fate of its citizens, and about the real intentions of key players, then the catastrophic situation could have been avoided. But he preferred to play a role in someone else's political game, not realizing that he is a tool in someone else's war. Today, he plays the role of defender of the civilized West from the "eastern barbarians" and even does not mind leading a crusade in the name of Western democracy.

The only problem is that he really got into the role and, most likely, he will not be able to get out of it. In reality he is a media support for the war, and he has no say in the real processes of the ongoing battles. Zelensky has given away his country to be a battleground of the war with the hope to win. The fact of the matter is that he wants to win personally, but the country has already lost.

Was it possible for Ukraine to win, or at least not to lose? You can give only a positive answer to this question: there was such an opportunity, and a very important one. Zelensky had means to prevent the outbreak of hostilities. Firstly, he had the approval of the Ukrainian people, where he, as the "president of peace", defeated in the elections the "president of war" Poroshenko. Secondly, Zelensky had important international support in the form of the Normandy Format, that supported the Minsk agreements. At the same time, it cannot be said that Zelensky rejected the Minsk [agreements] – on the contrary, on December 9, 2019, he, together with German Chancellor Angela Merkel, French President Emmanuel Macron and Russian President Vladimir Putin, signed the Paris Communiqué, where all parties declared their commitment to the Minsk agreements. At that time, it looked like the conflict would subside, and that the "president of peace" Zelensky would do what his predecessor had not done. But instead of that, Zelensky abandoned his standpoint, derailing the years of international diplomacy. Zelensky not only deceived his voters, but also nullified the efforts of European diplomats.

Were the Minsk agreements feasible? Of course, they were. It's just that their implementation did not suit neither President Poroshenko, nor his replacement President Zelensky, and most importantly, it didn't suit their owners. The fact is, if Donbass had re-joined Ukraine, the Ukrainian politics would radically change its landscape. The Pro-Western parties would have to concede a majority status in the parliament and go into opposition. Such a political configuration would maintain Ukraine as a neutral and peaceful country, but that would go against the interests of NATO.

Zelensky should have started building a new political architecture for the country that would take a balanced approach to the interests of the regions and the political ambitions of the leading parties. That would be the act of a mature, sensible, and self-confident politician. But Zelensky was bored with the daily routine of state administration, he failed to restore order in his own country, and it was easier for him to blame Russia for the problems rather than his own incompetence. Having earned sympathies of the Russian-speaking regions, he then started at the official level so strong anti-Russian hysteria that the conflict became inevitable. Zelensky repeatedly made it clear that there is a state bordering Russia that will do anything to make its life miserable. And to harm the neighbor in any way, the Ukrainians will stop at nothing. However, Zelensky didn't care about the sufferings of his country and doesn't care about it even now. He is bathing in the applause from the West, while Ukrainians are drowning in the bloodbath. And the more blood flows, the more there is applause. It remains to be hoped that they will run out of the applause before the Ukrainians run out of blood.

The Ukrainian conflict that looks like a single entity, is a combination of three different conflicts. The first conflict is a political one, when all non-pro-Western parties are not only ignored, but also declared traitors. Then there is an ethnical conflict, when representatives of the country's second largest ethnic group – the Russians and Russian-speakers (who in number equal to a population of a European country) - are deprived of their own native language, culture, and history. And there is a third, religious one. Zelensky with a medieval savagery set the Ukrainian state machine against the only canonical Orthodox Church in the country, that provoked a religious war. Last year alone, the UOC was deprived of 129 churches. It's like taking away churches from the Catholics in Poland and France under the pretext that they have connections with Rome. That is, the Ukrainian conflict is civil, ethnic and religious all at the same time, with the Ukrainian authorities pushing the people to all these conflicts, hiding behind the mask of Western democracy, and obediently fulfilling the wishes of the West.

And what is the point for Zelensky, who is the President of Ukraine, to act against the interests of his own country, contrary to his election promises, against peace and stability in Europe? The NATO policy has united the policy of Ukraine and the collective West together. From now on the defeat of Ukraine would be the defeat of NATO, although the alliance is not formally involved in the conflict. You can clearly see that Zelensky is not defending the position of Ukraine, but the position of NATO: he constantly renounces peace and demands weapons from the West to defeat Russia militarily. He has neither weapons, nor resources, nor an organized rear support for war - all this is laid as a heavy burden on Europe. What is the point of this political process?

And the point is that Zelensky, whether he realizes it or not, is a fifth column not only for Ukraine, but also for Europe. He was promoted to the presidency as being one of the lads, and instead of becoming a condemnation of his militant predecessor, he became a condemnation of his own country. He, as a young and energetic politician, is introduced into European diplomacy, and instead he becomes a condemnation of Europe. Why does no one notice this game? Because it's not allowed to do so. Today, Ukrainians are strictly forbidden to criticize Zelensky, otherwise they will fall under the pressure of repression and lawlessness. As for the Europeans they find it not respectable to criticize him, because NATO does not allow it. And he, who does not allow to see the real mechanisms of the conflict, has created it.

What's next?

Ukrainian opposition politicians, journalists, and just some concerned citizens did everything they could do to prevent Ukraine from becoming a battlefield. A lot of them sacrificed their lives, health, and freedom for this cause. But President Zelensky betrayed them, he betrayed them for the sake of a spectacular pose, for the sake of an approving pat on the shoulder from a "senior comrade", for the sake of appearing on the front pages of foreign publications. Zelensky betrayed the voters whom he promised peace, he betrayed the history of his country, the language he spoke, betrayed the neighboring country, where he made good money on corporate parties, and where he had friends and fans.

The applause of the West will not last long, and the Ukrainian people have long memory. Zelensky fancy himself to be a winner, and the winners are judges in their own right. He behaves like a winner, talks like a winner, poses like a winner. But all that doesn't do any good to victory. He rushes things - apparently suspecting that he will not enjoy the glorification for long. The time of judgment is inevitable, because he has gone too far. And for the show to go on, he needs a war.

And what he needs coincides with what the West needs - after all, for the time being they can use the Ukrainians as a war tool, whom Zelensky obligingly provided. But the question is not so simple. Europe and the US have different motivations. The war exhausts mainly the European Union, while the US benefits from the continuation of the war. Therefore, a clash of interests between the US and the EU is inevitable. And for the Europeans, Zelensky, who milks Europe like a cow, will soon stop looking like a cute and attractive person.

For the greater part of the world, the West in general does not look so sweet and attractive anymore. To get profit and keep the rest of the world in check, the golden billion is ready to go against its own rules, and to throw off the mask of being civilized. Most likely, this will not work, so Western politicians are preparing their citizens for the difficult times ahead.

All this cannot but result in building a more just world, a new security system, international relations and trade, multipolarity and mutual respect. Perhaps some very "democratic" politicians today do not want to respect other people's opinions and interests, but tomorrow they will have to do so.

Viktor Medvedchuk, Chairman of the political council of the Opposition Platform for Life (banned in Ukraine).